**DECL. OF MALCOLM LEADER-PICONE RE:** ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS

1

9

11

14

15

17

20

21

23

25

No. C07-03325 WHA

- 1. I am an attorney at law, licensed to practice before this Court, and counsel for defendants herein. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and, if sworn, could and would testify competently thereto.
- 2. On August 10, 2007, I received the email attached hereto as Exhibit "A" from plaintiff Robert Squires. The email had attached to it a pleading, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "B", which stated unequivocally as follows:

### TO THE COURT AND TO THE DEFENDANTS:

# PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, the Plaintiff concurs with the MOTION TO DISMISS.

- 3. Mr. Squires' pleading went on to explain why he had filed his lawsuit and how he had not understood that he had an administrative remedy that he could pursue.
- 4. As a result of Mr. Squires concurrence in the Motion to Dismiss, there does not appear to be any need for a hearing on the motion on August 16, 2007. Consequently, defendants respectfully request that the Court enter an order in the form submitted herewith granting the Motion to Dismiss.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: August 14, 2007.

MALCOLM LEADER-PICONE

## 1 PROOF OF SERVICE BY EMAIL AND FIRST CLASS MAIL 2 I, Malcolm Leader-Picone, declare that: 3 I am employed in the County of Alameda, California. I am over the age of eighteen years 4 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 2201 Broadway, Suite 803, Oakland, CA 5 94612. On August 14, 2007, I served the following document(s) entitled: 6 DECLARATION OF MALCOLM LEADER-PICONE IN SUPPORT OF ENTRY OF PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO F.R.C.P. Rule 7 12(b)(6) WITH CONSENT OF PLAINTIFF 8 and 9 10 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO F.R.C.P. Rule 12(b)(6) AND CONSENT OF PLAINTIFF. 11 12 upon the following person(s) in said action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed 13 envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid in the United States mail at Oakland, California addressed 14 as follows, and by electronic mail to the listed address(es): 15 Robert Squires, Sr. Jeanne L. Bakker, Esq. 3111 Paseo Granada Montgomery, McCracken, 16 Pleasanton, CA 94566 Walker & Rhoads, L.L.P. Avenue of the Arts Email: rsquires@pacbell.net 17 123 S. Broad Street Philadelphia, PA 19109 18 Email: jbakker@mmwr.com 19 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the 20 foregoing is true and correct. Executed at San Francisco, California, on August 14, 2007. 21 22 Malcolm Leader-Picone 23 24 25 26

27

DomainKey-Signature: a=rsa-sha1; q=dns; c=nofws;

s=s1024; d=pacbell.net;

h=Received: X-YMail-OSG: From: To: Subject: Date: Message-ID: MIME-Version: Content-Type: X-Mailer: X-MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Date: Message-ID: MIME-Version: Content-Type: X-Mailer: X-MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Date: Message-ID: MIME-Version: Content-Type: X-Mailer: X-MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Date: Message-ID: MIME-Version: Content-Type: X-Mailer: X-MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Date: Message-ID: MIME-Version: Content-Type: X-Mailer: X-MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Date: Message-ID: MIME-Version: Content-Type: X-Mailer: X-MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Date: Message-ID: MIME-Version: Content-Type: X-Mailer: X-MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Date: Message-ID: MIME-Version: Content-Type: X-Mailer: X-MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Date: Message-ID: MIME-Version: Content-Type: X-Mailer: X-MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Date: Message-ID: MimeOLE: Thread-Index; And the subject: Message-ID: MimeOLE: Message-ID: Message-ID: Message-ID: Message-ID: Message-ID: Message-ID: MimeOLE: Message-ID: Message-ID: M

Subject: C07-03325 WHA Robert Squires vs Celanese Americas Date: Fri, 10 Aug 2007 11:39:24 -0700 X-Mailer: Microsoft Office Outlook 11

Thread-Index: AcfbfcYOp7GFemzORG+32xLcEOcJHA==

X-Spam-Checker-Version: SpamAssassin 3.0.4 (2005-06-05) on mail23.sea5 X-Spam-Level: \*\*\*

X-Spam-Status: No, score=3.4 required=6.0 tests=BAYES\_60,HTML\_80\_90,

HTML\_MESSAGE autolearn=disabled version=3.0.4

The attached document, C07-03325 WHA Robert Squires vs Celanese Americas 08-10-07, was mailed 10 August 2007.

Plaintiff concurs with the MOTION TO DISMISS.

Robert Squires vs Celanese Americas 08-10-071.doc

**Exhibit** 

3111 Paseo Granada Pleasanton, CA 94566				
Phone Number: EMAIL:	925-846-6760 rsquires@pacbell.net			
ROBERT SQUIRES, SR.		)	No. C07-3325 WHA	
Plaintiff,		)	NOTICE OF MOTION and MOTION	
VS.		· )	TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO F.R.C.P	
		)	Rule 12 (b)(6):	
CLEANESE AMERICAS RETIREMENT		)		
PLANS SERVICE CENTER, CELANESE		)	Date: August 16, 2007	
AMERICAS CORPORTATION, and		)	Time: 2:00 p.m.	
CELANESE AMEI	RICAS CORPORATION	j	Ctrm.: 9, 19 <sup>th</sup> Floor	

TO THE COURT AND TO THE DEFENDANTS:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, the Plaintiff concurs with the MOTION TO DISMISS.

Hon. William H. Alsup U,S. District Court Judge

NOTICE OF MOTION TO DISMISS

RETIREMENT PENSION PLAN,

Defendants.

Robert Squires, Sr.

No. C07-03325 WHA August 10, 2007

### ORIGINAL JUSTIFICATION FOR FILING THE CLAIM

My claim was based upon the fact that the Celanese America Retirement Pension Plan Call Center (referred to as The Call Center within this document) did not honor a written commitment stated in a Hoechst letter of 20 May 1994. The commitment letter defined my entitlements for early retirement and the respective reduction factors to be utilized for early retirement. The Call Center did not provide any information on an ERISA / Celanese America required written appeals process beyond the written submission required by The Call Center. Also, The Call Center supervisor and manager, during a recorded conversation, specifically declined to provide an address or phone number for contacting a Celanese America lawyer to discuss my concerns.

The Defendant is now sharing an administrative remedy not previously provided during my 2-3 month, original verbal and written appeal process.

## **BACKGROUND DETAILS OF CLAIM**

My dispute with The Call Center (representing Syntex Corporation, Hoechst Corporation Retirement Plan), concerns the utilization of an incorrect "Early Retirement Factor" for my early retirement election (three years prior to full entitlement at age 65). I claim the factor should be .88 (of 88%) based upon a Hoechst 20 May 1999 letter. That letter referenced only one set of Retirement Factors for all potential plans. (This same information was also verbally communicated to me during my exit interview with the on-site San Jose Hoechst Human Resource Representatives during my termination exit interview process.) The Call Center is now claiming that their Retirement Plans have separate distinctive sets of retirement factor tables. Further, The Call Center held the Hoechst 20 May 1999 letter and validated its content. Yet, they did not honor its content. This proposed change in basic entitlements is occurring 9 years, 7 months after my termination and 7 years, 10 months after receipt of written notification of my entitlements. No other documentation or change notification had been

No. C07-03325 WHA August 10, 2007 received from the Hoechst Corporation Retirement Plan prior to my January 2007 commencement of the

retirement application process with The Call Center.

The table they claim that should be utilized would result in an "Early Retirement Factor" of 0.7120 (or 71.20%)

for early retirement three years prior to full entitlement at age 65. These applied Factors are to be utilized over the

full life of the retirement benefit payouts.

I have neither viewed, had knowledge of prior to February 2007, nor received any Retirement Factor tables beyond

those express within the Hoechst entitlement letter of 20 May 1999. That letter's Retirement Factor Tables were

presented on the same letter head paper (Hoechst) as the letter body. The document does not express any limiting

usage of provided tables or identify the table set to a specific plan. Therefore, reader has only one set of tables to

use for all potential plans.

DATED: August 10, 2007

BY:

Robert Squires, Sr.

Plaintiff

	Case 3:07-cv-03325-WHA Document 9 Filed 08/14/2007 Page 9 of 9  \( \begin{align*} \text{WBL-PSERVER2\BL-P FILES\CLIENT FILES\M TO O\MMWR\SQUIRES\MOTIONS\12\B)\( \text{B}\)\( \text{O}\text{OFM FIT OR MED TO S\14/0} \)  \( \text{VBL-PSERVER2\BL-P FILES\CLIENT FILES\M TO O\MMWR\SQUIRES\MOTIONS\12\B)\( \text{B}\)\( \text{O}\text{OFM FIT OR MED TO S\14/0} \)  \( \text{VBL-PSERVER2\BL-P FILES\CLIENT FILES\M TO O\MMWR\SQUIRES\MOTIONS\12\B)\( \text{O}\text{OFM FIT OR MED TO S\14/0} \)  \( \text{VBL-PSERVER2\BL-P FILES\CLIENT FILES\M TO O\MMWR\SQUIRES\MOTIONS\12\B)\( \text{O}\text{OFM FIT OR MED TO S\14/0} \)  \( \text{VBL-PSERVER2\BL-P FILES\CLIENT FILES\M TO O\MMWR\SQUIRES\MOTIONS\12\B)\( \text{O}\text{OFM FIT OR MED TO S\14/0} \)  \( \text{VBL-PSERVER2\BL-P FILES\CLIENT FILES\M TO O\MMWR\SQUIRES\MOTIONS\12\B)\( \text{O}\text{OFM FIT OR MED TO S\14/0} \)  \( \text{VBL-PSERVER2\BL-P FILES\CLIENT FILES\M TO O\MMWR\SQUIRES\MOTIONS\12\B)\)  \( \text{VBL-PSERVER2\BL-P FILES\CLIENT FILES\M TO O\MMWR\SQUIRES\MOTIONS\12\B)\( \text{O}\text{OFM FIT OR MED TO S\14/0} \)  \( VBL-PSERVER2\BL-P FILES\M TO S\14/0\TA\BL-P FILES\M TO S\				
1	pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on the grounds that Plaintiff had failed				
2	to exhaust his administrative remedies under the ERISA plan at issue. By a document served on August				
3	10, 2007, plaintiff Robert Squires concurred in the motion to dismiss.				
4	Therefore, based upon the moving papers and plaintiff's concurrence, and for good cause				
5	appearing, the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies under the				
6	ERISA plan that is at issue. Accordingly, Plaintiff's claim is hereby dismissed.				
7	SO ORDERED.				
8	DATED:				
9					
10	HON. WILLIAM H. ALSUP				
11	U.S. District Court Judge				
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23	·				
24					
25					
26					
27					
	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING				
	The state of the s				